

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/770,474	HU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anna Kinney	1731	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Pending

 (1) Anna Kinney.

(3) _____.

 (2) Kevin Murphy.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 September 2006
Time: 3 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called the applicant to discuss revising the species restriction established for this application. Due to claim language presented in the original claim, and to the combination of species elected by the applicant, a 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejection could not be resolved. In other words, when $t=0$ as elected by applicant, Y2 cannot be present, whereas applicant elected Y1 and Y2 are both present. Based upon revised claim language presented by the applicant, the Examiner confirmed the applicant's election of $t=0$, and requested that the applicant elect whether Y1 is present or absent. Mr. Murphy called back on September 22nd to elect Y1 is present, and indicated that the compounds of claims 13 and 14 are representative of this group. The Examiner also discussed discrepancies in the claim language which lend indefiniteness to the claims..